

to give our people information, as to the cost of this extraordinary Franchise Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it would be a misfortune if the hon. gentlemen were to allow so small a sum to the judges as to disgust them with the work. We had very great objections, as the Minister of Justice probably knows, to the appointment of revising barristers by the Government at all, and I have never changed my opinion that it was a most dangerous usurpation. But the point which removed a good deal of onus from the Government in the eyes of the people of Ontario, at any rate, was the employment of the judges, who had been, to a great extent, performing the same functions before. I take this opportunity of saying that I think the Government will commit a very serious error if they reduce the sum to be paid to the judges to such a miserable pittance, in view of the very serious amount of work they have to do, as to disgust these gentlemen with the office. The county judges in Ontario have from various causes of late been very hardworked, and the amount of additional work thrown upon them by the Franchise Bill has taxed their strength and time severely. Although I am not in favor of paying unreasonable salaries to them or to anybody, I think a fair allowance ought in all conscience and justice to be made to those gentlemen, and I trust that the Government will see fit to do it.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to continue my enquiries a little further. The Minister of Justice states that the revising officer is not to be paid for doing his duty in gathering information.

Mr. THOMPSON. I said they were not to be paid for travelling expenses in going about and collecting information, and I am sure they do not go about collecting information. I know that the revising officers of Ontario adopted a resolution which absolutely precluded that course, in which they stated their intention of acting only on stated evidence or their own knowledge, and not on their own motion, beyond using the means placed in their hands by the assessment roll and the list of electors. I am sure the revising officer in Northumberland has not gone about collecting information, but has waited until proper evidence was offered of the rights of parties to be put on or taken off the list. Of course some allowance must be made for travelling expenses in the gross sum to be paid.

Mr. MITCHELL. In reply to what the hon. gentleman says in relation to the revising officer in my county, I say the information I have got is that he has travelled around in some parishes, and by gaining personal information has endeavored to get up his list. If he goes into all the parishes his travelling expenses will be very considerable, and I think it would be wrong to refuse to pay the travelling expenses of these officers when they do travel. I quite agree with the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) that the duties of those revising officers are very important, and they should be paid fairly well. I would not argue giving them high salaries, but I would pay them what would be considered fair, handsome remuneration for the services they perform. I have no doubt they will do their duty fairly well, and I would not want those who have to travel around such an extensive county as mine not to be paid their travelling expenses. I think it would be a gross injustice to them.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Justice seems to misapprehend the functions of the revising officer. He supposes he is a judge. It is true he is in one sense; but he has to prepare the case for the judge as well. He is not to sit quietly in the court and hear claims and adjudicate on them. Such is not the spirit of the Franchise Act. His duty is to find out who are entitled to the franchise; he is not to wait in some quiet nook until they call upon him.

Mr. MITCHELL.

The theory is that the man entitled to a vote will seek his right, which is very good as a theory, but does not work in practice; so that I think the hon. gentleman will find that sooner or later he will have to meet the claims of these officers for travelling expenses. I would again ask whether any provision in this estimate is intended for the travelling expenses of the 211 clerks that are to be travelling about the country. If so, what is the *per capita* allowance to them?

Mr. THOMPSON. There is an allowance made for travelling expenses for each clerk. I cannot state the allowance per head, because it is a *per diem* allowance during actual employment, and it has not yet ceased.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman state what number of days are estimated for each clerk?

Mr. THOMPSON. Averages are very unreliable and very difficult to make.

Mr. MULOCK. I then come to the bailiff. I put the same question, and am I to consider I have the same answer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Having got this satisfactory information with regard to these officers, I now come to a more important functionary, and I am sure he will not be treated in that cavalier way in which bailiffs, clerks and judges have been treated: I come to the ruler of our country, the printer. I would ask whether there has been any tariff arranged in respect to the printing.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. 12½ cents per name, including the descriptions; and for all additions 12½ cents per name. That figure covers the three lists, the preliminary and the revised and the final.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there any estimate for rent of offices or court houses where the courts of revision will be held?

Mr. THOMPSON. None.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the estimated cost of procuring certified copies of the lists? and revised assessment rolls, according to the Franchise Act?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It varies from 75 cents to \$5. I do not speak of cities.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It will cost a great deal more than that.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the average?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I cannot say.

Mr. MULOCK. I am thoroughly satisfied now that the Government have the most conclusive data on which to invite the House to vote a specific sum of \$200,000, as the full amount necessary to put this Act in force.

Mr. MITCHELL. They do not seem to give it to us if they have.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is very unreasonable not to be satisfied with the lucid explanations we have had. Could the hon. member inform the House of the estimated cost to the country of procuring to the support of the Government each bad vote under this Act?

Mr. CASEY. The Government are treating the House with anything but respect in asking us to vote \$200,000 with such an utter lack of information as they have shown. The Minister of Justice said it was impossible yet to settle the salaries of the revising officers. There is no reason why they should not be settled now, for we can form a very fair idea of the work at present and the time it takes. The Minister of Justice knows well how much a judge expects to be paid per day for his time, when he is actually employed. I am not prepared at all to believe that the country